Page 1 of 2 04-1/864 USDC/MA Sortin, T

United States Court of Appeals For the First Circuit

No. 05-2285

IN RE: ROBERT RODRÍGUEZ,

Petitioner.

Before

Boudin, <u>Chief Judge</u>, Torruella and Lynch, <u>Circuit Judges</u>.

JUDGMENT

Entered: October 2, 2007

Robert Rodríguez, whose petition to vacate, set aside, or correct his sentence under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 was denied, has filed an application for a certificate of appealability of that denial. The sole issue he seeks to raise on appeal is whether <u>Cunningham</u> v. <u>California</u>, 127 S. Ct. 856 (2007); <u>United States</u> v. <u>Booker</u>, 543 U.S. 220 (2005); and <u>Blakely</u> v. <u>Washington</u>, 542 U.S. 296 (2004), all of which were decided after his conviction and sentence became final, apply retroactively to cases on collateral review. The district court denied a certificate of appealability on that issue because it had not been raised in the district court.

As the district court recognized, a habeas petitioner's failure to raise a claim before the district court ordinarily bars the petitioner from raising that claim on appeal from the district court's denial of the petition. <u>David v. United States</u>, 134 F.3d 470, 474 (1st Cir. 1998). Although we have discretion to override such a forfeiture, "[t]o justify deploying this seldom-used power, . . . the newly emergent contention must be one that practically guarantees the appellant's success." <u>Id.</u> at 475.

The issue that petitioner seeks to raise here is not of that caliber. This court has already held that petitions under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 are unavailable to advance <u>Booker</u> or other "<u>Blakely-like</u>" claims in the absence of Supreme Court decisions rendering those cases retroactive. <u>United States</u> v. <u>Fraser</u>, 407 F.3d 9, 11 (1st Cir. 2005); <u>Cirilo-Muñoz</u> v. <u>United States</u>, 404 F.3d 527, 533 (1st Cir. 2005). Given those prior rulings, which would bind the panel assigned to decide this prospective appeal, <u>United States</u> v.

Malouf, 466 F.3d 21, 27 (1st Cir. 2006), cert. denied, 127 S. Ct.
1892 (2007), petitioner has not made the requisite "substantial
showing of the denial of a constitutional right," 28 U.S.C. §
2253(c)(2), to warrant granting his application.

The application for a certificate of appealability is <u>denied</u>, and the appeal is <u>terminated</u>.

By the Court:

Richard Cushing Donovan, Clerk.

MARGARET CARTER

By: Chief Deputy Clerk.

Certifled and Issued as Mandate under Fed. R. App. P. 41.

Richard Cushing Donovan, Clerk

Deputy Clerk

Date: 11/23/07

[cc: Robert Rodriguez, Dina M. Chaitowitz, AUSA]